<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. . The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on November 11, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   <u>Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6-10, and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)</u>

Claims 1, 3, 6-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kenyon *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

> A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation*** set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ***The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim***. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant's claimed subject matter teaches a method of sharing computer objects between different computer spaces and forming new associations between a shared object and objects existing in a computer where the shared object is moved into. To this end, independent claim 1 recites: *sharing the selected object from the first computer space with a second computer space, **the second computer space including one or more of the first objects; identifying in the second computer space the one or more first objects; and automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the one or more associations in the first computer space between the selected object and the first objects in the second computer space.*** Similarly, claim 10 recites: ***instructions for sharing the selected object from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including one or more of the***

first objects; *instructions for identifying in the second computer space the one or more first objects; and instructions for automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the one or more associations in the first computer space between the selected object and the one or more first objects in the second computer space.* Kenyon *et al.* does not disclose such claim features.

Kenyon *et al.* provides for a method of generating a navigational model for linking together information objects on an existing information space. The overlay includes concept nodes expressing concepts. If a digital information object is encountered, it is examined to determine if it has at least one concept in common with concepts expressed in concept nodes. If yes, then the digital information object is automatically and dynamically linked to each concept node expressing common concepts. (*See* Kenyon *et al.* Abstract). Kenyon *et al.* also teaches that the overlay can be shared between users/computers. On page 3 of the subject Final Office Action, it is contended that in teaching the sharing of the overlay, Kenyon *et al.* teaches the claimed aspects. However, as taught by Kenyon *et al.* the overlay consists of linked network of concept and information objects that reflect the user's interest in a given area (*See* Kenyon *et al.* col.3 lines 31-35). Thus in accordance with Kenyon *et al.*, when an over lay is shared/transferred between computer spaces, it implies that the documents and associations contained in the overlay are also transferred from one computer space to the other.

In contrast, the claimed subject matter relates to transferring/sharing only computer objects but not object associations between computer spaces. Thus, when an object is transferred between computer spaces associations between a shared object and other objects already existing in a new space into which the shared object is transferred are automatically formed. Hence, in accordance with the claimed subject matter, only computer objects need to be shared while associations are automatically formed when a shared object moves into a new space (*See* applicants' specification as filed Fig. 4 and related text at paragraph [0048]). This mitigates the need for sharing both objects as well as their associations as taught by Kenyon *et al.*

From the foregoing, it is clear that an identical invention as recited in the subject claims is not disclosed or suggested by Kenyon *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, and 10 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection of Claims 2, 5, 11, and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 5, 11, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon et al. (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Batty et al. (US 6,223,212 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 2, 5, 11 and 14 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III.   Rejection of Claims 4 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Batty *et al.* (US 6,223,212 B1) as applied to claims 3 and 12, and further in view of Hatori (US 2003/00221122 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.*, Batty *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Claims 4 and 13 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* Hatori *et al.* relates to a computer enhancing a security level when connecting to a network, and fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* and Batty *et al.* Additionally, it is erroneously contended on page 9 of the subject Office Action that Hatori discloses a file sharing device. However, at the cited portion Hatori teaches a simple file download/execution on/off switching device that enables or disables download of files via a network based on a user specification or on security information related to the network recognized by a network recognition device. Hatori fails to teach or suggest *automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the intervening first object, together with the direct association between the selected object and the intervening first object and the direct association between the intervening first object and the particular first object* as recited in

claims 4 and 13. Such functionality allows a shared object to be used in the second computer space with the same association-based functionality as in the first computer space including association –based security, association-based linking of related object, association –based accessing of objects etc. (*See* applicant's specification as filed paragraph [0050]). Such aspects are neither suggested nor taught either alone or in combination by the cited documents. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 15-17 and 19-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 15-17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon *et al.* (US 6,792,430) in view of Hatori *et al.* (US 2003/00221122). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Independent claim 15 recites *in a context association system for forming context associations between first and second objects that are stored in computer memory and are associated with each other based on user computer interactions, a method of sharing computer objects, comprising:* ***storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first computer space, and*** *wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications; initiating sharing of the selected object from the first computer space with the second computer space;* ***determining whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold; and interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.*** Independent claim 19 recites similar features. Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Kenyon *et al.* discloses a method of generating a navigational model for linking together information objects on an existing information space. As discussed *supra* with respect to independent claim 1, Kenyon *et al.* does not teach *storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and*

a second computer space, **wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon interactions between the user and the objects** as recited by the subject claims. The Examiner cites Hatori *et al.* to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.*

Hatori *et al.* relates to a computer enhancing a security level when connecting to a network. At the cited portions, Hatori *et al.* discloses a user setting security information in association with a network connection to be used, storing the security information in a predetermined memory and disabling processes related to sharing files, performed by other network connected computers based on the stored security information. However, Hatori *et al.* is silent regarding teach *storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space,* **wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first computer space,…. interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold** as recited by the subject claims.

From the foregoing, it is clear that Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claims 15 and 19 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

V.   Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Hatori (US 2003/00221122 A1) and further in view of Batty *et al.* (US 6,223,212 B1). . Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claim 18 depends from independent claims 15. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all features of independent claim 15. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP685US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

 /Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731